

Appl. No. 09/732,568
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2004
Reply to Office action of February 25, 2004

APP 1265

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification is being amended correctly to identify Figure 8a and to correct some erroneous reference numerals.

The drawing is being amended to delete the identification "Figure 8" and correctly to identify the individual figures 8a and 8b and to correct the heading of Figure 8a to read "Contact Object".

Claim 8 is being amended to correct the typographical error, as noted by the Examiner, and now properly depends from claim 5.

Claims 1-11 were rejected by the Examiner, 35 USC 102 (e), as being anticipated by Spielman et al patent 6,560,318 (hereinafter Spielman). In response thereto applicants are canceling claims 1-4 and 11; amending claim 5 to include the subject matter of prior claim 1 and also further to specify the contents of the smart events, amending claim 10 to include the subject matter of its prior dependent claim 11, and canceling claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner errs in asserting that the Spielman disclosure teaches or suggests applicants' invention. In fact, the Spielman system presents precisely the problem of the prior art and which problem is solved by applicants' invention. Spielman's teaching is directed to a system in which there is centrally stored the hierarchy of preferences of what the client wishes to receive in the notification system. As such there is indeed an object based contact list in Spielman but it is located in what Spielman refers to as a protocol based subscriber directory. ("The notification process accesses subscriber profile information from an open protocol-based subscriber directory based on the received notification message." Abstract, lines 7-10) similarly, in the material specifically identified by the Examiner (column 4, lines 30-33), Spielman states "Another aspect of this present invention provides a server configured for storing subscriber notification preference information in a subscriber directory..." The reference by the Examiner to Spielman's disclosure, at column 10, lines 53-64 is similarly a description of this centralized directory management process which stores the subscriber notification process information. This is a description of prior art notification systems.

As the applicants have stated in the summary of their invention (page 4, lines 13-18) "In traditional event notification systems, an event encapsulates only opaque data, and event subscribers are assumed to know how to respond to the event. In contrast, in the illustrative embodiment herein disclosed, the NSPs are the event publishers and they utilize smart events to control how the OBCLs that are the event subscribers respond to their events. Accordingly, an OCBL may be built once and yet be utilized for different services of different NSPs simultaneously."

This is in sharp contrast to the centralized storage process of Spielman. Spielman, as is true of the prior art, requires that the subscriber or client have the information and software it requires for a notification system prestored and already available in the client computer for a particular notification system. In Spielman the client computer can not handle multiple notification systems unless and until the software updates for each of these systems have already been prestored at the client computer.

Page 6 of 8

Appl. No. 09/732,568
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2004
Reply to Office action of February 25, 2004

APP 1265

However, in accordance with applicants' invention, there is no need for software updates to a client computer, as applicants' invention allows for adjustment of the behavior of the client computer to permit it to respond to new or different notification systems after the client computer has been originally installed and set up.

Applicants have amended their claims more precisely to define their smart events and thus more precisely to recite their invention. "Smart events" are described in applicants' specification, including at page 12, lines 23-27 " Smart event 26 not only contains the latest state information on the subscribed data items but also contains program instructions that specify if and how OBCL 10 should respond to smart event 26. These program instructions are called the response instructions of a smart event 26. In addition, smart event 26 contains the subscription data, namely SID 24 as shown in Figure 3, so that OBCL 10 can determine that smart event 26 is associated with contact object 25." See also Figure 9 and page 14, line 27 et seq. and Figure 20 and page 22, line 20 et seq describing the processing of a smart event, including, at line 30 "Then contact object 29 executes code contained in smart events."

Claim 5, as amended, recites applicants' inventive system wherein the client computer includes the object based contact system employing lists, and not a centralized server, and a contact manager for managing smart events forwarded to it, "said smart events including both state information on client data items and also program instructions that specify how the object based contact system responds to said smart events." Such is clearly neither disclosed nor suggested by Spielman. Dependent claims 6-9 further recite aspects of applicants' invention including the smart events and the utilization of such smart events at the client computer. With respect to claim 8, the Examiner had referred to Spielman's Figs. 4A and 4B. These figures, however, disclose solely the contents of the server list of preferences and do not teach or suggest any logic or processing including a response address, as recited in claim 8.

Amended claim 10 recites applicants' inventive method wherein the notification service provider sends notifications to the object based contact system employing lists at the client computer " said notifications including smart events and said smart events including both state information on subscriber data items and also program instructions that specify how said OBCL responds to each smart event."

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 5- 10, as amended, are therefore respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is now in condition to be passed to issue, and such action is also respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner deems it would in any way expedite the allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number set forth below.

Appl. No. 09/732,568
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2004
Reply to Office action of February 25, 2004

APP 1265

A petition for a one month extension of time is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

S. R. Dalal et al

By 

James W. Falk
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 16, 154
(732) 699-4465